

University of Tartu  
Department of Psychology

Kati Koido

THREE THEMES OF INDIVIDUALISM AND  
DEVELOPMENT OF THE ESTIND SCALE

Master's thesis

Supervisors: Jüri Allik, *PhD*  
Anu Realo, *PhD*

Running head: ESTIND Scale

Tartu 2000

Contents

ABSTRACT..... 3

KOKKUVÔTE ..... 4

INTRODUCTION ..... 5

DEFINITIONS AND RELATED CONSTRUCTS OF INDIVIDUALISM IN CROSS-  
CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY ..... 6

    DEFINITIONS OF INDIVIDUALISM..... 6

    INDIVIDUALISM AND RELATED CONSTRUCTS ..... 9

    THE AIM OF THE STUDY ..... 10

METHOD ..... 11

    PARTICIPANTS ..... 11

    MEASURES OF INDIVIDUALISM ..... 11

    OTHER MEASURES..... 13

    PROCEDURE..... 15

RESULTS ..... 15

    MEASURES OF INDIVIDUALISM ..... 15

    CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE SCALES OF INDIVIDUALISM AND OTHER MEASURES ..... 19

DISCUSSION ..... 22

    RELATIONS BETWEEN THREE MEASURES OF INDIVIDUALISM ..... 22

    RELATIONS BETWEEN INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM..... 23

    RELATIONS BETWEEN INDIVIDUALISM AND OTHER CONSTRUCTS ..... 23

REFERENCES ..... 25

*ACKNOWLEDGMENTS*..... 31

APPENDIX 1.....32

APPENDIX 2.....34

### **Abstract**

Individualism has been described to be a broad concept consisting of many different components. Three themes were proposed to be core attributes of individualism: (1) Autonomy, (2) Self-Sufficiency, and (3) Self-Assurance. Three instruments were developed to operationalize the concept of individualism in a way defined above and to establish in what relation it stands in the respect of the three forms of collectivism, Familism, Companionship, and Patriotism as found by Realo, Allik, & Vadi (1997). In addition, relations between individualism and four other constructs were measured. The developed individualism measure – the ESTIND-P scale – showed good reliability properties. The correlations between the ESTIND-P scale and the measure of collectivism (the ESTCOL scale) indicated that individualism and collectivism cannot be considered the opposite poles of the same dimension but rather as independent concepts.

### Kokkuvõte

Individualismi ja kollektivismi on psühholoogias intensiivselt uuritud viimased kakskümmend aastat. Käesoleva uurimuse üheks eesmärgiks oli anda selgem tähendus individualismile, mida on nimetatud kõikehõlmavaks ja laiaks konstruktsiooniks. Teisteks eesmärkideks oli uurida individualismi ja kollektivismi vahelist seost, samuti seoseid individualismi ja võistluslikkuse, nartsissismi, makjavellismi ja kontroll-keskme vahel. Uurimuse aluseks oli kontseptsioon, mille kohaselt individualismi võiks käsitleda kolme teemana : (1) autonoomia – enese defineerimine iseseisva ja teistest inimestest või gruppidest sõltumatuna; (2) eneseküllasus – enda teadvustamine isetegutseva subjektina; (3) enesekindlus – enese tajumine unikaalse ja teistest erinevana. Uurimuse käigus loodi kokku kolm erinevat skaalat, mis mõõdavad vastavalt kolme eelnimetatud individualismi teemat (ESTIND-P ja ESTIND-N) ning individualismi kolme grupi (perekond, sõbrad ja riik) suhtes (3-LIQ). Saadud tulemused lubavad oletada, et individualismi ja kollektivismi näol on tõepoolest tegemist kahe suhteliselt iseseisva dimensiooniga. Statistiliselt olulisteks osutusid seosed individualismi ja võistluslikkuse, nartsissismi ning kontroll-keskme vahel, makjavellismiga olid seotud enesekindlus ESTIND-P alaskaalana ja individualism perekonna suhtes 3-LIQ alaskaalana.

## Introduction

The constructs of individualism and collectivism have received a lot of researchers' attention. Although aforementioned constructs have been popular in most of the social sciences for about a century, the more systematic and intensive investigation began after the Hofstede's (1980) influential study, which found individualism versus collectivism to be one of the most distinctive dimensions on which cultures vary (cf. Realo, 1998; Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990). Kagitçibasi and Berry (1989) have identified individualism and collectivism as one of the major themes of cross-cultural psychology in the 1980s. But it has been considered the 1990s to be even more fertile years for the development of theory and method around these constructs (Triandis, Chen, & Chan, 1998).

Regardless of great popularity and success of individualism and collectivism, they have also received criticism. The main statement has been that the constructs are too broad, fuzzy, and all-embracing and the refinement in conceptualization and measurement of individualism and collectivism is suggested and indicated (Chen, Meindl, & Hunt, 1997; Gaines *et al.*, 1997; Gelfand, Triandis, & Chan, 1996; Kagitçibasi, 1994, 1997; Niles, 1998; Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995)

Individualism and collectivism were treated as opposite poles of one dimension by Hofstede (1980), some other researchers have also obtained results that confirm the unidimensionality of the construct (Gerganov, Dilova, Petkova, & Paspalanova, 1996; Wojciszke, 1997). Many other studies, however, have suggested that the individualism and collectivism are orthogonal unipolar dimensions (Freeman, 1996; Gaines *et al.*, 1997; Gelfand, Triandis, & Chan, 1996; Rhee, Uleman, & Lee, 1996; Triandis, 1990; Triandis, 1994; Triandis *et al.*, 1986; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988a; Triandis *et al.*, 1990) which "can coexist and are simply emphasized more or less in each culture, depending on the situation" (Triandis, 1993, p. 162). This research concentrates mainly on individualism following the assumption that individualism and collectivism are not the opposites of each other. The aim of this study is to refine the meaning of



individualism and to find its core components as it was done in regard to collectivism by Realo, Allik, & Vadi (1997).

Although Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clack (1985) have proposed to use terms individualism and collectivism for analyses at the cultural level and terms *idiocentrism* and *allocentrism* for analyses at the individual level, the more popular and widely used concepts individualism and collectivism are employed in this paper to describe both cultural and individual level constructs.

### **Definitions and Related Constructs of Individualism in Cross-Cultural Psychology**

The idea of the individual as a value, can be traced back to almost every great civilization. For some scholars, however, the idea of individualism has been related exclusively to the Christianity or to the emergence of “individuality” in Europe at the end of the XIth century (Gurevich, 1995). Individualism has been considered to consist of different number of components (e.g., religious, political, economical, and cultural) and related to many other constructs (modernity, holism etc.). In the next section, a short overview will be presented about various definitions and attributes of individualism used mainly in psychology since Hofstede’s study in 1980. For the historical overview about studying individualism in various disciplines, see for example Gelfand, Triandis, & Chan (1996), Kagitçibasi (1997), and Triandis (1995).

#### *Definitions of Individualism*

Hofstede (1980, 1991) used the terms of individualism and collectivism to describe possible forms of the relationship between individuals and the groups to which they belong. According to him, individualism applies to a society in which the ties between individuals are loose and everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family only. It may be suggested on the basis of this that one attribute of individualism is the primacy of one’s own self: in individualistic cultures the self is perceived as independent, self-contained, autonomous, and distinct unit, which is an unique center of cognition, emotion, and action (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Semin, 1996; Triandis, Brislin, & Hui, 1988b).

In later research, Triandis and his colleagues have defined many attributes and characteristics of individualism and individualists. For instance, individualists are loosely linked individuals who view themselves as independent of collectives, their self is defined almost entirely in individual terms. They are primarily motivated by their own preferences, needs, rights, and the contracts they have established with others. Individualistic people emphasize rational analyses of the advantages and disadvantages to associating with others and their personal goals are more important than in-group goals. Such people are also emotionally detached from their in-groups, and in-groups are perceived as more heterogeneous than out-groups. Social control depends more on guilt than on shame and reflects contractual arrangements. Individualists are ready to confront in-group members with whom one disagrees; competition, and personal fate are emphasized; internal control is high; values are personal (e.g., creative, brave, happy); and there is a congruence between private self and public self (Triandis, 1990, 1995; Triandis *et al.*, 1990, 1993). Triandis (1995) has also summarized four defining attributes of individualism:

- (1) the definition of the self is independent in individualism;
- (2) individualists have personal goals that may or may not overlap with the goals of their in-groups and consider it “obvious” that personal goals should have priority over group goals;
- (3) social behaviors of individualists are governed by individual attitudes, preferences, and interests;
- (4) individualists treat relationships instrumentally and drop them when costs exceed the benefits.

In a comprehensive review of the literature on individualism and collectivism, a theoretical and measurement refinement of the constructs was suggested by Singelis and his colleagues (1995). They proposed that the most important attributes of individualism and collectivism are the horizontal and vertical aspects of social relations (see also Triandis, 1993; Triandis, 1995). Following the idea that there are four kinds of selves: independent and interdependent (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) and same and different, Singelis and colleagues (1995) proposed a new typology of the combinations of these four types of selves (see Külvet, 1998, for a review) – namely, vertical and horizontal

collectivism and vertical and horizontal individualism. The latter two can be defined as perceiving the self as independent and different from the selves of others; the individual is seen as autonomous and competitive (*vertical* individualism) and perceiving the self as independent and same from the selves of others, yet, the individual is seen as autonomous with emphasis on equality (*horizontal* individualism).

Different researchers have suggested more components and correlates of individualism: Hsu (1983), for instance, considered self-reliance, competitiveness; aggressive creativity; conformity; insecurity; large military expenditures; prejudice toward racial and religious groups that are too different; and unrealistic interpersonal relationships (and international relations — policeman of the world) – as the characteristics of individualism [from Triandis, 1990]. Waterman (1984) described individualism in terms of four positive psychological characteristics such as (1) sense of personal identity (Erikson), (2) self-actualization (Maslow), (3) internal locus of control (Rotter), and (4) principled moral reasoning (Kohlberg) [from Hui & Yee, 1994]. Bellah with colleagues (1985) identified American individualism as follows: self-reliance, independence and separation from family, religion, and community; hedonism, utilitarianism, and emphasis on exchange; competition, equity and fairness in the distribution of rewards; trust in others; emphasis on competence; involvement in community life (getting something in return); equality of people and the rejection of arbitrary authority; the self as the only source of reality. Ho and Chiu (1994) saw value of the individual; autonomy; individual responsibility (consequences of action affect the individual); individual achievement; self-reliance (individual interests; security in individual's strength) as the characteristics of individualism [from Kagitçibasi, 1997].

At the cultural level, individualism has been defined as a “cultural syndrome,” reflecting shared attitudes, beliefs, categorizations, norms, roles, and values organized around a central theme, that are found among individuals who speak a particular language, and live in a specific geographic region, during a specific historical period. The central theme of individualism is the conception of the individuals as autonomous from groups (Triandis 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996; Triandis, Chan, Bhawuk, Iwao, & Sinha, 1995).



### *Individualism and Related Constructs*

At the individual level, individualism has been found to be related to achievement motivation, alienation, anomie, and greater loneliness and at the cultural level to be associated with high levels of Gross National Product, but also to several forms of social pathology, such as high crime, suicide, divorce, child abuse, emotional stress, and physical and mental illness rates (cf. Triandis *et al.*, 1985).

Individualistic values have been found to be an exciting life, a varied life, a spiritual life, an enjoying life, a comfortable life, freedom, equality, competition, pleasure, social recognition, self-respect, independent, intelligent, and helpful (Triandis *et al.*, 1985, 1990, 1993). Schwartz (1990) considered hedonism (enjoyment), achievement, self-direction, social power, and stimulation to be values which all serve the self-interests of the individual -- which are individualistic types of values. Later, he has replaced individualism and collectivism with two higher order value dimensions -- namely 'openness to change' (self-direction and stimulation) vs. 'conservation' (conformity, tradition and security) at the individual level and 'autonomy' vs. 'conservation' at the cultural level. The other dimension is 'self-enhancement' (achievement and power) vs. 'self-transcendence' (universalism and benevolence) at the individual level; culture level counterparts being 'hierarchy' and 'mastery,' respectively (Schwartz, 1994).

It has been suggested by several authors, that individualism may be related to the internal locus of control (cf. Rotter, 1966). For instance, Hui (1988) has described the internal locus of control as one of the four basic attributes of individualism-collectivism. Also, according to Triandis (1995), individualists attribute their success as well as other events to their own individual attributes more than collectivists. A closer look at the two constructs at the cultural level was made by Smith, Trompenaars and Dugan (1995) who found a strong relationship between the Rotter's internal-external locus of control and Hofstede's (1980) dimension of individualism-collectivism. The correlation between the internal locus of control and individualism was as high as .70 at  $p < 0.0001$  (Smith *et al.*, 1995).

### *The Aim of the Study*

The word 'individualism' originates from a Latin word *individuum* which means 'indivisible'. If one looks at the content of individualism, there seems to be three different ways in which person can be 'indivisible' and not abridged to something external to him, at least ignoring all political and religious connotations of this word. (1) *Autonomy*. According to this aspect, person defines himself, or is defined by others, as an autonomous and largely independent agent without references to other people, groups, or institutions. It means, in particular, that person is independent and autonomous from other people and groups. Priority is given to individual aims, decisions and choices; (2) *Self-sufficiency*. This aspect emphasizes the person's ability to supply all needs without assistance and confidence in one's own abilities. Person feels that he or she is the center of action, the most things are conditioned from person's own will; (3) *Self-assurance*. This aspect stresses person's confidence in oneself and awareness of being the only one of its kind. Person perceives oneself as without equal, characteristically different from others.

The aim of this study was to develop an instrument which could operationalize the concept of individualism in a way defined above and to establish in what relation it stands in the respect of the three forms of collectivism, Familism, Companionship and Patriotism, postulated by Realo *et al.* (1997). On that purpose, a relatively large set of items was generated by a group of experts to cover the whole range of possible meanings of individualism. In addition to the items generated by the experts, all available instruments measuring various aspects of individualism and/or collectivism were looked through with the purpose to 'borrow' items that were not proposed by the experts. This set of items along with a number of previously developed instruments measuring individualism and collectivism or related constructs were administered to the participants of this research.

## Method

### *Participants*

The sample for this study consisted of 304 subjects (77 males and 227 females). One-hundred and forty-six subjects were the applicants for admission to the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Tartu. Seventy-four participants were the students of the Department of Psychology of the University of Tartu. The rest of the participants were students of two high-schools in the town and county of Tartu as well as adults with diverse socio-demographical background. Subjects' age ranged from 15 to 73 with the mean age 20.4 years ( $SD = 6.1$ ). Data were collected from June to November 2000.

### *Measures of Individualism*

*The Individualism Scale (ESTIND).* It was decided to develop two different scales to measure three themes of individualism. The first one (ESTIND-P) was intended to be a personally worded scale, which would directly measure individualistic attitudes and behaviors, e.g., "I don't let other people to change me" (*"Ma ei lase teistel inimestel ennast muuta"*). The second scale (ESTIND-N) was planned to be a normatively or generally worded scale with items such as "The most important thing for an individual is an independence from the others" (*"Inimese jaoks on peamine iseseisvus ja sõltumatus teistest"*), for instance, which would measure guiding principles and values which people may consider to be true but not binding, that is person may act inversely to the principle regarded to be important and right in life by him or her. The aim was to examine whether these two scales are related, that is whether people who hold individualistic principles also say that they behave according to those principles.

*Item development of the ESTIND Scale.* One-hundred and two personally and normatively worded items were generated considering three themes of individualism:

- (1) Autonomy, e.g., personally worded item: "I am disturbed when somebody tries to intervene my life" (*"Mind häirib, kui püütakse minu ellu sekkuda"*); e.g., normatively worded item: "Individual should stand up for what one



thinks right, regardless of what others think” (*“Inimene peaks seisma selle eest, mida ta õigeks peab, hoolimata sellest, mida teised arvavad”*);

- (2) Self-sufficiency. e.g., personally worded item: “Most of the important decisions in my life have been determined by chance, not by my own will” (*“Enamuse tähtsaid otsuseid mu elus on määranud juhus, mitte minu kindel tahe”*); e.g., normatively worded item: “All things in this world depend on individual’s own will” (*“Kõik siin ilmas sõltub inimese enda tahtest”*);

- (3) Self-assurance. e.g., personally worded item: “I am not like other people” (*“Ma ei ole teiste inimeste moodi”*); e.g., normatively worded item: “Every person is unique and different from the others” (*“Iga inimene on kordumatu ja teistest erinev”*).

In addition to the items concentrating on these three themes, 168 items measuring individualistic attitudes, values and behaviors were added to the original item-pool from 17 different scales and questionnaires (e.g., the INDCOL Scale, Hui, 1988; Value Profile, Bales and Couch, 1969; Personal Value Scales, Scott, 1965). Four experts (the author, a graduate student and two faculty members of the department) gave their ratings to each item considering item’s relevance to the theoretical concept of individualism introduced above. Ratings were given on a 3-point scale running from 2 (“the item is very good, it should certainly stay in the item-pool”) to 0 (“the item should certainly be excluded from the item-pool”) with 1 in the middle indicating that the item can be both included or excluded in the item-pool. On the basis of the experts’ ratings, 92 personally worded items and 33 normatively worded items were selected for the final item-pool. The participants of this research were asked to indicate their agreement with the items on a 6-point Likert-type agreement-disagreement scale.

*The Three-Level Individualism Questionnaire (3-LIQ)*. Following the three-factor model of collectivism developed by Realo *et al.* (1997), an attempt was made to develop also a three-level individualism scale. On that purpose, 16 core attributes of individualism were selected and subjects were asked to rate how important a given principle or value is in relations with: (1) one’s family or close people; (2) peers (friends, co-workers, etc.); and (3) society (nation, public opinion, etc.) using a 7-point Likert-type agreement-disagreement scale. From the methodological point of view, the new scale bears some



resemblance with the Individualism-Collectivism Interpersonal Assessment Inventory developed by Matsumoto and his colleagues (1997).

### *Other Measures*

In order to validate the new individualism measures as well as to study their relations with several other closely related constructs, seven other scales were used in this research. The ESTCOL Scale, the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism-Collectivism Scale (HVCI), and the Schwartz's Person Profiles Scale (SPPS) were used to examine the dimensionality and relationship between individualism and collectivism. The Buss Competitiveness Scale (BCS), the Machiavellianism Scale (MACH), the Narcissism Scale (NPI), and the Rotter Internal-External Control Scale (REI) were used to measure relationships between new measures of individualism and various other constructs that have been associated with individualism in cross-cultural literature. It should be emphasized here that the list of constructs to be measured in relation to individualism in this study was definitely not exhaustive – our final choice of measures depended first and foremost on availability of respective scales in Estonian.

*The ESTCOL Scale.* According to Realo and colleagues (1997), there are at least three interrelated, yet distinguishable subtypes of collectivism focused on relations with family (C1), peers (C2), and society (C3). These types share common core which is superordinate to these particular forms of collectivism. The scale, measuring the three subtypes of a collectivism, consisted of 24 items and subjects were asked to indicate their agreement-disagreement with items on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The internal reliabilities of C1, C2, and C3 subscales were .83, .68, and .80, respectively.

*The Horizontal and Vertical Individualism-Collectivism Scale (HVCI).* The scale was developed by Singelis and colleagues (1995) and adapted to Estonian by Külvet (1998). The Estonian version of the scale consisted of 29 items, the items were answered on a 5-point Likert-type agreement-disagreement scale. The Cronbach alphas were .54, .58, .67, and .78 for HC, VC, HI, and VI subscales, respectively.

*The Schwartz's Person Profiles Scale (SPPS).* The values were measured using Schwartz's Person Profiles Scale (SPPS: Schwartz, 1997). Scale was adapted to Estonian

during the cross-cultural research project on "Social Representations of HIV/AIDS in Central and Eastern Europe" (see Goodwin, Realo, Kwiatkowska, Kozłowa, Nguyen Luu, & Nisharadze (2000) for more details). SPSS is a 29-item questionnaire which can be used to assess values at both the individual and cultural level. Respondents were asked to consider 29 descriptions of imaginary individuals and asked "How much the person in the description is like you?" responding on 6-point scales ranging from "Not like me at all" to "Very much like me". Scale items were divided into ten value types (measuring Hedonism, Self-Direction, Stimulation, Conformity, Tradition, Security, Universalism, Benevolence, Achievement and Power) then formed into the two dimensions Openness to Change versus Conservatism and Self-Transcendence versus Self-Enhancement. Cronbach alphas ranged from .51 (Self-Direction and Tradition) to .77 (Achievement).

*The Buss Competitiveness Scale (BCS)*. Buss (1986) developed 10-item unidimensional scale to measure interpersonal competition, in contrast to contests involving groups or struggles in the workplace. The scale was translated into Estonian in connection with this study. Subjects were asked to indicate their agreement-disagreement with items on a 6-point Likert-type scale. The internal reliability of the scale was .76.

*The Machiavellianism Scale (MACH)*. The machiavellianism was measured using the MACH Scale, originally developed by Christie and Geis (1970) and adapted to Estonian by Paaksi (1998). The scale consists of 30 items, subjects gave their ratings on a 6-point Likert-type agreement-disagreement scale. In Paaksi's (1998) study, the Cronbach alpha of the scale was .82.<sup>1</sup>

*The Narcissism Scale (NPI)*. The Narcissism was measured with 63-item scale, which was adapted to Estonian by Saluveer (1998) and contained adapted items from two measures: the Narcissistic Personality Inventory developed by Raskin and Hall (1979) and the Murray's Narcissism Scale (Murray, 1938). Estonian version of the scale measures three aspects of narcissism with three subscales: (1) Vanity subscale contains items which describe self-exposure and self-admiration; (2) Entitlement subscale

---

<sup>1</sup> The sum scores of the Machiavellianism Scale and the Narcissism Scale in this study were kindly calculated by Aleksander Pulver. Unfortunately, he refused to provide us with any further information either in regard to the Cronbach alphas of the scales or the specific information on the composition of the scales. Therefore, the internal reliability coefficients or any other specific item-related information of the two scales mentioned above, cannot be reported for this study.

measuring emphasizing one's singularity; (3) Hypersensitivity subscale assessing hypersensitivity toward negative evaluations (Saluveer, 1999). Subjects were asked to give their ratings on a 6-point Likert-type agreement-disagreement scale. The Cronbach alphas in Saluveer's (1999) study were .83, .87, and .77 for Vanity, Entitlement, and Hypersensitivity, respectively.

*The Internal-External Control Scale (REI).* The Internal-External Control Scale was developed by Rotter (1966) and re-adapted into Estonian by Koido (1998a) for measuring locus of control. The Estonian version of the scale consisted of 29 forced-choice items, of which 6 were filler items as an original scale. Koido (1998b) obtained results which indicated three factor solution of the scale: (1) Personal Control (PC) (e.g., "Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me" vs. "It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life"); (2) Social-Political Control (SPC) (e.g., "With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption" vs. "It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office"); (3) Academic Control (AC) (e.g., "In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test" vs. "Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless"). Cronbach alphas were .69, .57, and .45 for PC, SPC, and AC scales, respectively.

### *Procedure*

Subjects for this study were recruited on a voluntarily basis. In most cases, the subjects completed a battery of psychological questionnaires individually, there was no time limit for completing the tests.

## **Results**

### *Measures of Individualism*

*Internal structure of the ESTIND-P Scale.* Ninety-two items of the ESTIND-P scale were analyzed using explorative factor analysis principal component method followed by a varimax normalized rotation. Analyses revealed that factors formed around themes of



three hypothesized themes of individualism. Next, the best ‘simple’ factor solution for three factors was tried to establish on the basis of the factor loadings. The results of the item-analysis, descriptive statistics and the wording of the items were also taken into consideration while constructing the scale. The final version of the ESTIND-P Scale contained three factors which accounted for 40.7% of the total variance. These factors pertained to three aspects of individualism: (1) autonomy (AT); (2) self-sufficiency (SS); and (3) self-assurance (SA). The first factor consisted of 10 items, the rest two factors both of 7 items. Table 1 shows the items and the factor loadings of the ESTIND-P Scale. The intercorrelations between the three subscales were all statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ): between AT and SS subscales  $r = .20$ ; between AT and SA subscales  $r = .30$ ; and SS and SA subscales  $r = .23$ . Cronbach alphas were .79, .76, and .74 for AT, SS, and SA subscales, respectively. Age was correlated statistically significantly only with SA subscale ( $r = -.17, p < .05$ ), this moderate negative correlation suggests that only in some aspects, younger people tend to be somewhat more individualistic than older people. Men ( $m = 32.2, SD = 5.3$ ) were higher than women ( $m = 30.7, SD = 5.3$ ),  $t(298) = 2.1, p = .04$  on SA scale. The general individualism index IND (AT + ST + AS) was also higher for men ( $m = 109.1, SD = 11.6$ ) than for women ( $m = 105.6, SD = 12.0$ ),  $t(296) = 2.3, p = .03$ .



Table 1

Factor Loadings of the ESTIND-P Scale

Factor Loadings				
Item No	AT	SS	SA	R <sup>2</sup>
13	<b>.53</b>	-.06	.10	.27
18	<b>.55</b>	.22	.12	.31
24	<b>.48</b>	-.11	.19	.29
38	<b>.61</b>	.18	.10	.44
39	<b>.57</b>	.07	.05	.32
44	<b>.57</b>	-.01	-.05	.30
45	<b>.59</b>	.11	.06	.36
46	<b>.66</b>	.15	.00	.39
51	<b>.53</b>	.10	.17	.32
57	<b>.70</b>	.01	.07	.43
8	.11	<b>.65</b>	.09	.39
23	-.05	<b>.51</b>	.00	.24
62	.15	<b>.63</b>	.21	.36
73	.20	<b>.58</b>	.04	.35
77	-.21	<b>.71</b>	-.01	.45
87	.13	<b>.66</b>	.20	.41
89	.14	<b>.65</b>	-.05	.44
31	.15	-.02	<b>.72</b>	.41
37	.27	-.06	<b>.39</b>	.21
48	.07	.19	<b>.74</b>	.49
54	.22	.06	<b>.60</b>	.35
67	-.16	.08	<b>.58</b>	.31
74	-.01	.28	<b>.58</b>	.37
91	.24	-.03	<b>.67</b>	.37

Note. N = 298. Loadings greater than |.30| are boldfaced.  
AT = Autonomy; SS = Self-Sufficiency; SA = Self-Assurance.  
R<sup>2</sup> = variable communalities.

*Internal structure of the ESTIND-N Scale.* Thirty-three normatively worded items were also analyzed using principal component method followed by a varimax normalized rotation. Analyses did not reveal the expected three-factor solution, the search for the best possible simple structure eventually led us to an one-factor solution, consisting of 9 items measuring the construct of autonomy. Table 2 shows the loadings of the factor. One-factor solution accounted for 42.3% of the total variance and the internal reliability of the

scale was .83. There was no statistically significant correlation between age and the ESTIND-N scale. Also, there were no gender differences on this scale -- men's ( $m = 41.3, SD = 6.9$ ) and women's ( $m = 41.6, SD = 5.8$ ) scores were not significantly different from one another.  $t(298) = -.28, p = .78$ .

Table 2

*Factor Loadings of the ESTIND-N Scale*

Factor Loadings		
Item No	AT	R <sup>2</sup>
9	<b>.65</b>	.32
11	<b>.60</b>	.30
12	<b>.62</b>	.31
14	<b>.72</b>	.42
16	<b>.65</b>	.32
24	<b>.75</b>	.43
27	<b>.64</b>	.33
30	<b>.59</b>	.28
33	<b>.60</b>	.28

*Note.*  $N = 300$ . Loadings greater than  $|.30|$  are boldfaced.  
AT = Autonomy.  $R^2$  = variable communalities.

*Internal Structure of the Three-Level Individualism Questionnaire (3-LIQ).* This questionnaire consisted of three separate 16-item scales, which measured individualism in relation to family (I1), peers (I2), and society (I3). At first, each scale was separately subjected to a principal component analysis by which procedure unidimensional solutions were obtained for each scale consisting of 9 identical items. Table 3 shows factor loadings of the three separate unidimensional scales. I1 scale accounted for 31.3%, I2 scale for 30.2%, and I3 scale for 31.4% of the total variance. The Cronbach alphas were .70, .69, and .71 for I1, I2, and I3 scales, respectively. The intercorrelations between the three subscales were all statistically significant at  $p < .05$ : between I1 and I2 subscales,  $r = .44$ ; between I1 and I3 subscales,  $r = .30$ ; and I2 and I3 subscales,  $r = .33$ . Age was not correlated with any of these scales, no statistically significant gender differences were obtained on any scales.

Table 3

*Factor loadings of the I1, I2, and I3 Scales*

Factor Loadings			
Item No	I1	I2	I3
1	<b>.72</b>	<b>.71</b>	<b>.58</b>
2	<b>.52</b>	<b>.61</b>	<b>.69</b>
3	<b>.62</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>.62</b>
4	<b>.53</b>	<b>.51</b>	<b>.64</b>
5	<b>.34</b>	<b>.48</b>	<b>.48</b>
10	<b>.59</b>	<b>.46</b>	<b>.44</b>
12	<b>.52</b>	<b>.36</b>	<b>.43</b>
13	<b>.47</b>	<b>.58</b>	<b>.59</b>
14	<b>.62</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>.52</b>

*Note.* *N* = 301. Loadings greater than |.30| are boldfaced. I1 = individualism towards family;  
I2 = individualism towards peers;  
I3 = individualism towards society.

*Correlations between the Scales of Individualism and Other Measures*

As mentioned in the introductory section, one of the aims of this study was to examine relationship between individualism and collectivism as well as correlations between individualism and competitiveness, locus of control, machiavellianism, narcissism and values. Also, we were interested to see how much different individualism scales measure the same thing. The correlational analysis was used on that purpose – the results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Correlations between Individualism measures and the Other Scales

Scale	AT	SS	SA	IND	NORM_AT	I1	I2	I3
AT	1.00	.20*	.30*	.74*	.64*	.39*	.37*	.25*
SS	.20*	1.00	.23*	.67*	.17*	.09	.28*	.07
SA	.30*	.23*	1.00	.70*	.29*	.15*	.13*	.09
IND	.74*	.67*	.70*	1.00	.54*	.31*	.39*	.20*
NORM_AT	.64*	.17*	.29*	.54*	1.00	.29*	.38*	.21*
I1	.39*	.09	.15*	.31*	.29*	1.00	.44*	.30*
I2	.37*	.28*	.13*	.39*	.38*	.44*	1.00	.33*
I3	.25*	.07	.09	.20*	.21*	.30*	.33*	1.00
COL1	.07	-.11	-.13*	-.08	.22*	-.29*	-.08	-.20*
COL2	-.04	-.16*	-.10	-.15*	.08	-.16*	-.25*	-.17*
COL3	-.07	.00	-.01	-.04	.12*	-.15*	-.08	-.42*
COL	-.01	-.11	-.10	-.11	.18*	-.26*	-.16*	-.34*
HC	-.05	-.04	-.01	-.05	.04	-.20*	-.18*	-.20*
VC	-.06	-.03	-.10	-.10	.11	-.29*	-.13*	-.25*
HI	.37*	.34*	.56*	.61*	.36*	.34*	.30*	.15*
VI	.23*	.19*	.26*	.32*	.28*	.16*	.12*	-.06
BCS	.18*	.25*	.36*	.37*	.27*	.05	.11	-.05
MACH	.04	-.02	.17*	.09	.03	.13*	.10	.09
NPI	.30*	.31*	.57*	.56*	.37*	.09	.08	-.01
VAN	.12*	.21*	.52*	.39*	.10	-.04	-.02	-.04
HYP	.07	-.15*	.23*	.07	.15*	.04	-.16*	-.14*
ENT	.21*	.52*	.45*	.55*	.29*	.10	.16*	.02
PC	-.18*	-.27*	.05	-.19*	-.13*	-.08	-.11	-.06
SPC	-.01	-.11	.03	-.05	.00	-.06	-.02	.05
AC	-.07	-.13*	.12*	-.04	-.08	.04	-.10	.03
REI	-.15*	-.27*	.07	-.17*	-.11	-.06	-.11	-.02
UNIV	.12*	.01	.00	.06	.16*	-.04	-.01	-.14*
ACH	.14*	.30*	.45*	.41*	.16*	-.03	.04	-.10
TRAD	.06	-.16*	-.21*	-.14*	.16*	-.18*	-.11*	-.19*
BEN	.19*	.18*	.07	.21*	.24*	-.17*	-.07	-.08
SEC	.11	.11*	.01	.11	.18*	-.19*	-.07	-.26*
STIM	.21*	.18*	.33*	.34*	.25*	.05	.07	.12*
HED	.18*	.05	.25*	.22*	.22*	-.01	-.01	.09
POW	.15*	.10	.26*	.24*	.13*	.01	.02	.05
SELF-DIR	.34*	.38*	.34*	.51*	.31*	.22*	.27*	.16*
CONF	.02	-.07	-.15*	-.09	.13*	-.29*	-.14*	-.27*
SELF-TR	.18*	.10	.03	.15*	.23*	-.12*	-.05	-.13*
CONS	.08	-.04	-.14*	-.05	.19*	-.27*	-.13*	-.29*
OPEN	.32*	.32*	.42*	.50*	.33*	.15*	.18*	.16*
SELF-EN	.20*	.19*	.41*	.37*	.21*	-.02	.02	.01

Note. *N* = 304, the number of subjects may vary due to the missing data. The ESTIND-P Scale: AT = autonomy; SS = self-sufficiency; SA = self-assurance; IND = individualism index (AT + SS + SA); the ESTIND-N Scale: NORM\_AT = autonomy; the 3-LIQ: I1 = individualism toward family; I2 = individualism



toward peers; I3 = individualism toward society; the ESTCOL Scale: C1 = family collectivism; C2 = peers collectivism; C3 = society collectivism; COL = general collectivism index (C1 + C2 + C3); the HVCI Scale: HC = horizontal collectivism; VC = vertical collectivism, HI = horizontal individualism, VI = vertical individualism; the BCS: BCS = competitiveness index; the MACH Scale: MACH = machiavellianism index; the NPI Scale: NPI = narcissism index; VAN = vanity; HYP = hypersensitivity; ENT = entitlement; the REI Scale: PC = personal control; SPC = social-political control; AC = academic control; REI = locus of control (PC + SPC + AC); the SPPS: UNIV = universalism; ACH = achievement; TRAD = tradition; BEN = benevolence; SEC = security; STIM = stimulation; HED = hedonism; POW = power; SELF-DIR = self-direction; CONF = conformity; SELF-TR = self-transcendence; CONS = conservatism; OPEN = openness to change; SELF-EN = self-enhancement.  
Statistically significant correlations are boldfaced.

\*  $p < .05$

As can be seen from this table, correlations between different individualism measures are statistically significant indicating that they are measuring the same construct, although different aspects of it. That our new measures are indeed measuring individualism is also confirmed by significant positive correlations between three new scales and individualism subscales of the HVCI scale. There are no significant correlations between the ESTIND-P scales and collectivism subscales of the HVCI scale and three significant yet relatively low correlations between the ESTIND-P and the ESTCOL subscales (C2 and SS, C1 and SA, C2 and IND), thereby indicating that individualism and collectivism appear to be relatively independent dimensions. The three significant correlations between the ESTIND-N and the ESTCOL subscales (C1 and NORM\_AT, C3 and NORM\_AT, COL and NORM\_AT) seem to suggest that indeed, "one cannot be really individualist without being somewhat collectivist at the same time" as it was suggested by Realo (1999, p. 15). Negative correlations between the 3-LIQ and the ESTCOL scale are statistically significant, except two correlations from 12. This shows that if both collectivism and individualism are measured towards specific groups – the constructs appear to act as the opposites of one dimension.

As expected, competitiveness and individualism are positively correlated – people scoring high on individualism are also more competitive. Machiavellianism and individualism are related through two aspects: people scoring high on SA (Self-Assurance) and family-related individualism (I1) tend to score higher also on machiavellianism, that is, they may use all means to gain their aims. Narcissism and individualism seem to be related relatively strongly. Positive correlations between

subscales of the ESTIND scales and subscales of the NPI scale indicate that people scoring higher on individualism tend also to be more self-admiring and stress their singularity. As expected, people high on individualism tend to attribute things happen to them to their own attributes having an internal locus of control as can be concluded from negative statistically significant correlations between individualism measures and the REI scale. Yet, the correlations between the two measures at the individual level ( $r = -.15$  and  $-.27$ ) are considerably lower than those obtained by Smith and colleagues (1995) at the cultural level ( $r = .70$ ). Significant positive correlations between individualism and individualistic values of the SPPS (achievement, stimulation, hedonism, power, and self-direction) confirm also that new measures are indeed measuring individualism.

## Discussion

### *Relations between three measures of individualism*

At first, it can be said that all three measures of individualism developed in this study (i.e., the ESTIND-P, the ESTIND-N, and the 3-LIQ) showed satisfactory internal reliability with the Cronbach alphas running from .69 (I2, the 3-LIQ) to .83 (the ESTIND-N). Also, the positive correlations between the individualistic values of the SPPS, individualism subscales of the HVCI scale and our three individualism scales indicated the high validity of the new individualism measures. The intercorrelations of the three individualism measures were also statistically significant, although not very high. These moderate correlations between the three new individualism scales suggest that they are not quite measuring the same higher-order concept of individualism but rather its marginally overlapping components. On the basis of these results, one may speculate that individualism does not form a unitary concept as it was found in case of collectivism, for instance (cf. Realo *et al.*, 1997). Autonomy, however, appears to be a major theme of individualism that is more or less covered by all three measures of individualism.

In designing this study, we were also interested in whether people who value individualism as a general guiding principle, also report themselves acting or behaving in a similar way. Strong correlation ( $r = .64$ ,  $p < .05$ ) between the Autonomy subscales of

the ESTIND-P and the ESTIND-N scales suggests that indeed, people emphasizing individualism as a general principle, also tend to prefer to act in an individualistic manner. Furthermore, the mean scores of the two scales were highly similar ( $m = 4.61$  and  $4.68$ , respectively), suggesting that in general, people's answers to the two set of items are in good concordance.

#### *Relations Between Individualism and Collectivism*

One of the aims of this study was to examine relationship between individualism and collectivism. The results of this study clearly indicate that individualism, as it was defined in this study, and three-factor model of collectivism (Realo et al., 1997), do not form opposite poles of one single dimension. They can be considered as two different constructs, orthogonal in the relation to each other. This conclusion is based on the correlations between the ESTIND-P, the ESTCOL, the ESTIND and collectivism subscales of the HVCII scale. The positive relationship between the ESTCOL and the NORM\_AT scale supports assumption that individualism and collectivism can be regarded, in some cases at least, as preconditions of each other (Realo, 1999). However, NORM\_AT needs further investigation, may be it measures something else in addition to autonomy, for example social desirability. Yet, the negative correlations between the 3-LIQ and the ESTCOL scale show that if both collectivism and individualism are measured towards specific groups – the constructs may indeed be negatively related to each other. Further studies are needed to determine the nature of this relationship.

#### *Relations between Individualism and Other Constructs*

Positive correlation between individualism and competitiveness was expected and confirms previous conceptualizations (eg., Bellah et al., 1985; Hsu, 1983) that individualistic people emphasize competing and being the best. It is also not surprising, that narcissism was quite strongly related to individualism. Although this relationship has been theoretically discussed in previous studies (Triandis, 1990), it was difficult to anticipate such a massive overlap between all facets of individualism and narcissism. Further studies are needed to clarify what is specific to individualism and narcissism, provided that they can be still treated as two separate concepts. Machiavellianism showed



two relatively low positive correlations with two aspects of individualism, self-assurance and individualism toward family. On the basis of these results it is premature to suggest that more individualistic people manipulate more with other people to accomplish their aims, although theoretically it would be pretty much expected that machiavellian persons are also somewhat selfish and self-interested (Paaksi, 1998). There are only few studies in which the relationship between locus of control and individualism/collectivism has been examined at the individual level (cf. Koido, 1998b). The results of this study show that indeed, individualistic people have a more internal locus of control. In other words, it means that individualistic people consider things happening to them to be conditioned from their own personal attributes and will as well as they believe that external forces, like other people, fate, luck etc. do not play big role in shaping their life.

### *Conclusion*

Taken together, it can be said that the study answered several important questions about the nature of individualism and its relation to collectivism and several other constructs but also raised a few as outlined above. The future studies would pay closer attention to the positive correlations between the scale measuring individualism as a general principle and various other constructs such as collectivistic attitudes and values emphasizing security, traditionalism, and conformity. Also, a negative relationship between context (or group)-related measures of individualism and collectivism deserves further consideration.



### References

- Bales, R., & Couch, A. (1969). The value profile: A factor analytic study of value statements. *Sociological Inquiry*, 39, 3-17. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), (1991), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes*. Academic Press.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Buss, A. H. (1986). *Social behavior and personality*. LEA, Hillsdale.
- Chen, C. C., Meindl, J. R., & Hunt, R. G. (1997). Testing the effects of vertical and horizontal collectivism: A study of reward allocation preferences in China. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28, 1, 44-70.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.
- Freeman, M. A. (1996). Factorial structure of individualism-collectivism in Sri Lanka. *Psychological Reports*, 78, 907-914.
- Gaines, S. O., Jr., Marelich, W. D., Bledsoe, K. L., Steers, W. N., Henderson, M. C., Granrose, C. S., Barájas, L., Hicks, D., Lyde, M., Takahashi, Y., Yum, N., Rios, D. I., Garcia, B. F., Farris, K. R., & Page, M. S. (1997). Links between race/ethnicity and cultural values as mediated by racial/ethnic identity and moderated by gender. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 6, 1460-1476.
- Gelfand, M. J., Triandis, H. C., & Chan, D. K.-S. (1996). Individualism versus collectivism or versus authoritarianism? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 397-410.
- Gerganov, E. N., Dилова, M. L., Petkova, K. G., & Paspalanova, E. P. (1996). Culture-specific approach to the study of individualism/collectivism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 277-297.

- Goodwin, R., Realo, A., Kwiatkowska, A., Kozlova, A., Nguyen Luu, L. A., & Nizharadze, G. (2000). Values and sexual behavior in Central and Eastern Europe. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Gurevich, A. (1995). *The origins of European individualism*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Ho, D. Y.-F. & Chiu, C.-Y. (1994). Component ideas of individualism, collectivism and social organization: An application in the study of Chinese culture. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitçibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (pp. 137-156). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hsu, F. L. K. (1983). *Rugged individualism reconsidered*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Hui, C. H. (1988). Measurement of individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 22, 17-36.
- Hui, C. H., & Yee, C. (1994). The shortened individualism-collectivism scale: Its relationship to demographic and work-related variables. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 28, 409-424.
- Kagitçibasi, C., & Berry, J. W. (1989). Cross-cultural psychology: Current research and trends. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 40, 493-531.
- Kagitçibasi, C. (1994). A critical appraisal of individualism and collectivism: Toward a new formulation. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitçibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 52-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kagitçibasi, C. (1997). Individualism and collectivism. In J. W. Berry, Y. H. Poortinga, J. Pandey, P. R. Dasen, T. S. Saraswathi, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitçibasi (Series Eds.)

- & J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitçibasi (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 3. Social behavior and applications* (2nd ed., pp. 1-49). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Koido, K. (1998a). *Rotter'i eksternaalse-internaalse kontroll-keskme skaala: taasadapteerimine eesti keelde ja seosed kollektivistlike hoiakutega*. Unpublished seminar paper. Department of Psychology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia.
- Koido, K. (1998b). *Rotter'i eksternaalse-internaalse kontroll-keskme skaala struktuur ning seosed individualistlike ja kollektivistlike hoiakutega*. Unpublished bachelor thesis. Department of Psychology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia.
- Külvet, A. (1998). *Convergent measurement of collectivism*. Unpublished seminar paper. Department of Psychology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- Matsumoto, D., Weissman, M. D., Preston, K., Brown, B. R., Kupperbusch, C. (1997). Context-specific measurement of individualism-collectivism on the individual level: The individualism-collectivism interpersonal assessment inventory. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28, 743-767.
- Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Niles, F. S. (1998). Individualism-collectivism revisited. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 32, 4, 315-341.
- Paaksi, E. (1998). *Makjavellilik isiksus*. Unpublished bachelor thesis. Department of Psychology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia.
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 45, 590.
- Realo, A. (1998). Collectivism in an individualist culture: The case of Estonia. *Trames*, 2, 19-39.
- Realo, A. (1999). *Individualism and collectivism: An exploration of individual and cultural differences*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia.

- Realo, A., Allik, J., & Vadi, M. (1997). The hierarchical structure of collectivism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 93-116.
- Rhee, E., Uleman, J. S., & Lee, H. K. (1996). Variations in collectivism and individualism by ingroup and culture: Confirmatory factor analyses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 1037-1054.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 1 (Whole No. 609).
- Saluveer, T. (1998). *Nartsissistliku isiksuse testi adapteerimine*. Unpublished seminar paper. Department of Psychology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia.
- Saluveer, T. (1999). *Nartsissistliku isiksuse testi (NIT) psühhomeetrilised omadused*. Unpublished bachelor thesis. Department of Psychology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21, 2, 139-157.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitçibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 85-122). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1997). Values and culture. In D. Munro, S. Carr, & J. Schumaker (Eds.), *Motivation and Culture* (pp 69-84). New York: Routledge.
- Scott, W. A. (1965). *Values and organizations: A study of fraternities and sororities*. Chicago: Rand McNally. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), (1991), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes*. Academic Press.
- Semin, G. R. (1996). Individualism-collectivism. In A. S. R. Manstead, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *The Blackwell encyclopedia of social psychology* (pp. 320-324). Blackwell Publishers.



- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29, 3, 240-275.
- Smith, P. B., Trompenaars, F., & Dugan, S. (1995). The Rotter locus of control scale in 43 countries: A test of cultural relativity. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30, 377-400.
- Triandis, H. C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 41-133). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1993). Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 27, 155-180.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kagitçibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 41-51). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1996). The psychological measurement of cultural syndromes. *American Psychologist*, 51, 407-415.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, C. H., Marin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J. B. P., Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, H., & de Montmollin, G. (1986). The measurement of the etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 257-267.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988a). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 323-338.
- Triandis, H. C., Brislin, R., & Hui, C. H. (1988b). Cross-cultural training across the individualism-collectivism divide. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 12, 269-289.

- Triandis, H. C., Chan, D. K.-S., Bhawuk, D. P. S., Iwao, S., & Sinha, J. B. P. (1995). Multimethod probes of allocentrism and idiocentrism. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30, 4, 461-480.
- Triandis, H. C., Chen, X. P., & Chan, D. K.-S. (1998). Scenarios for the measurement of collectivism and individualism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 275-289.
- Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., & Clack, F. L. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19, 395-415.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., Betancourt, H., Iwao, S., Leung, K., Salazar, J. M., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J. B. P., Touzard, H., & Zaleski, Z. (1993). An etic-emic analysis of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 24, 3, 366-383.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 5, 1006-1020.
- Waterman, A. S. (1984). *The psychology of individualism*. New York: Praiger.
- Wojciszke, B. (1997). Parallels between competence- versus morality-related traits and individualistic versus collectivistic values. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 245-256.

### *Acknowledgments*

*I would like to thank my supervisors Anu Realo and Jüri Allik for valuable guide and encouragement. I am very grateful to everybody who supported me in my study.*

## ESTIND

*Antud küsimustik koosneb kokku 139 väitest. Palun lugege iga väidet tähelepanelikult ja hinnake, kui võrd hästi see Teid iseloomustab ehk kui õigeks Te seda peate. Oma vastus kirjutage palun väite ees olevale punktiirile. Hindamiseks kasutage järgmist skaalat:*

Kirjutage "6" kui väide on Teie arvates	täiesti õige
Kirjutage "5" kui väide on Teie arvates	peaaegu õige
Kirjutage "4" kui väide on Teie arvates	pigem õige kui vale
Kirjutage "3" kui väide on Teie arvates	pigem vale kui õige
Kirjutage "2" kui väide on Teie arvates	peaaegu vale
Kirjutage "1" kui väide on Teie arvates	täiesti vale

- ..... 1. Ma tean, kes ma olen ja mida soovin saavutada
- ..... 2. Kui midagi läheb halvasti, siis ei aja ma seda olukorra või juhuse süüks
- ..... 3. Minu jaoks on oluline olla vaba oma tegemiste kavandamisel ja valikul
- ..... 4. Püüan alati endast aru saada
- ..... 5. Ma ei kuulu ühessegi parteisse, organisatsiooni või ühingusse
- ..... 6. Mind ei saa süüdistada teiste ebaõnnestumistes
- ..... 7. Mulle ei meeldi, kui mind püütakse "raamidesse" suruda
- ..... 8. Koosolekutel võtan olulistes küsimustes alati sõna
- ..... 9. Mulle meeldib olla omaette
- ..... 10. Katsun alati kontrollida oma mõttekäigu õigsust
- ..... 11. Mulle meeldib ise oma tegemiste üle otsustada
- ..... 12. Usun, et suunan ise oma elukäiku
- ..... 13. Mind häirib, kui püütakse minu ellu sekkuda
- ..... 14. Ma olen võimeline tunnistama oma vigu
- ..... 15. Ma ei lase ennast mõjutada teiste inimeste arvamustest
- ..... 16. Hindan inimestes eelkõige sõltumatust ja kompetentsust
- ..... 17. Mul pole erilist tarvet enda olemuse ja iseloomu üle juurdlemiseks
- ..... 18. Otsuste tegemisel lähtun eelkõige iseenda vajadustest ega lase end teistel mõjutada
- ..... 19. Vastutan ise oma tegude eest
- ..... 20. Mulle meeldib teha asju omal viisil
- ..... 21. Ma ei saa aru, kust läheb piir minu ja teiste inimeste vahel
- ..... 22. Mulle ei meeldi, kui ma pean kellestki sõltuma
- ..... 23. Enamuse tähtsaid otsuseid minu elus on määranud juhus, mitte minu kindel tahe
- ..... 24. Minu huvid ja eesmärgid on mulle kõige tähtsamad

- ..... 25. Sageli mõtlen selle üle, kes ma olen
- ..... 26. Mulle meeldib suhelda inimestega, kes omavad oma sõltumatut arvamust
- ..... 27. Toetun kõiges peamiselt iseendale
- ..... 28. Olen valmis oma vigu tunnistama
- ..... 29. Kui vähegi võimalik, siis istun bussis või rongis teistest eemale
- ..... 30. Ma pole kunagi kindel, kas mingi mõte on minu enda oma või olen seda kusagilt mujalt kuulnud
- ..... 31. Olen alati tahtnud teistest millegi poolest erineda
- ..... 32. Otsustan ise oma tegude üle
- ..... 33. Keegi ei tunne mind nii hästi kui ma ise
- ..... 34. Mulle meeldib, kui on selgelt piiritletud, mis roll on minul ja kõigil ülejäänutel
- ..... 35. Tähtsate otsuste langetamisel usaldan iseennast
- ..... 36. Kui mul midagi ebaõnnestub, ei süüdistan ma tavaliselt selles iseennast
- ..... 37. Minus on omadusi, millest teised inimesed pole teadlikud
- ..... 38. Soovin ise otsustada mind puudutavate küsimuste üle
- ..... 39. Toimin tavaliselt nii, nagu õigeks pean
- ..... 40. Ülikoolis õppides eelistaksin omaette elamist ühiselamutoale
- ..... 41. Minu kordaminekud ja ebaõnnestumised on tingitud minust endast
- ..... 42. Mulle ei meeldi, kui tehakse selgelt vahet enda ja teiste vahel
- ..... 43. Ma olen iseseisev ja teistest sõltumatu inimene
- ..... 44. Lõppkokkuvõttes ei esinda ma kedagi peale iseenda
- ..... 45. Minu elu määravad eelkõige minu enda otsustused ja valikud
- ..... 46. Ma ei lase teistel inimestel ennast muuta
- ..... 47. Olen oma tegude peremees
- ..... 48. Mulle meeldib eristuda "hallist massist"
- ..... 49. Tulen oma eluga iseseisvalt suurepäraselt toime
- ..... 50. Ma ei karda endale vastutust võtta
- ..... 51. Üle kõige siin maailmas hindan isikuvabadust
- ..... 52. Ma jälgin ennast pidevalt kõrvalt
- ..... 53. Kui mind miski häirib, siis ütlen selle ka välja
- ..... 54. Ma ei ole teiste inimeste moodi
- ..... 55. Kui võimalik, võtan hotellis üheinimese toa
- ..... 56. Ma arvan, et olen usaldusväärne inimene
- ..... 57. Tavaliselt teen seda, mis on mulle kõige parem, ükskõik mida teised ütlevad
- ..... 58. Ma ei ole inimene, kes kõike endale ahnitseb
- ..... 59. Mul on mu sisemine "mina", mille olemasolu teised ei aima
- ..... 60. Hakkan vastu teiste inimeste püüetele mind kujundada
- ..... 61. Mõtisklen sageli iseendast
- ..... 62. Ma olen ettevõtlik ja pealehakkaja inimene
- ..... 63. Tean täpselt, millised on minu eesmärgid ja huvid ega lase neid teistel muuta või mõjutada
- ..... 64. Nii palju kui ma ennast mäletan, olen ma enda olemasolust teadlik olnud



- ..... 65. Mulle ei meeldi teistest inimestest sõltuda
- ..... 66. Olen uhke oma saavutuste üle
- ..... 67. Ma ei erine millegi poolest tuhandetest teistest inimestest
- ..... 68. Arvan, et juhin ise oma saatust
- ..... 69. Ma ei mõtle endast kui mingi grupi või rühma esindajast
- ..... 70. Arvan, et keegi ei tunne mind paremini kui ma ise
- ..... 71. Mulle ei meeldi pealetükkivad inimesed
- ..... 72. Minu elukaik sõltub minust endast
- ..... 73. Kui mul on mingist asjast oma arvamus, ei karda ma seda välja öelda
- ..... 74. Minu jaoks on oluline teiste seast silma paista
- ..... 75. Ma saan ise oma asjadega hakkama
- ..... 76. Eelistan iseseisvat tööd grupitööle
- ..... 77. Mulle ei meeldi olukorrad, kus ma pean millegi olulise eest vastutust kandma
- ..... 78. Ma ei lase teistel enda eest otsustada
- ..... 79. Usun iseendasse
- ..... 80. Tunnen, et ma ei kontrolli täielikult sündmusi, mis mu elus ette tulevad
- ..... 81. Hindan kõrgelt oma isiklikku vabadust
- ..... 82. Käitun samamoodi sõltumata sellest, kellega ma koos olen
- ..... 83. Olen täielikult vastutav oma sõnade ja tegude eest
- ..... 84. Ma ei kuluta palju aega selle üle mõtlemiseks, kes ma selline olen
- ..... 85. Oma ettevõtmistes juhindun iseenda vajadustest ja eesmärkidest
- ..... 86. Eneseteostus on minu elus üheks kõige olulisemaks väärtuseks
- ..... 87. Mind peetakse inimeseks, kellel on oma sõltumatu arvamus
- ..... 88. Ma jälgin pidevalt kõrvalt seda, mida ma teen ja mõtlen
- ..... 89. Mulle ei meeldi olukorrad, kus tuleb endal otsuseid langetada
- ..... 90. Ma teen vaid asju, mida õigeks pean
- ..... 91. Arvan, et olen iseloomult üsna eripärane inimene
- ..... 92. Mulle ei meeldi, kui teised "oma nina minu asjadesse topivad"

Järgmisena on toodud hulk väiteid, mis kirjeldavad erinevaid põhimõtteid ja väärtusi, millest inimesed oma elus juhivad. Palun lugege iga väidet tähelepanelikult ja hinnake, kuivõrd **õigeks** Te seda peate. Oma vastus kirjutage palun väite ees olevale punktiirile, vastamisel kasutage järgmist skaalat:

Kirjutage "6" kui väide on Teie arvates  
Kirjutage "5" kui väide on Teie arvates  
Kirjutage "4" kui väide on Teie arvates  
Kirjutage "3" kui väide on Teie arvates  
Kirjutage "2" kui väide on Teie arvates  
Kirjutage "1" kui väide on Teie arvates

täiesti õige  
peaaegu õige  
pigem õige kui vale  
pigem vale kui õige  
peaaegu vale  
täiesti vale

- ..... 1. Iga inimene on kordumatu ja teistest erinev
- ..... 2. Käituda tuleks nii, et ei rikutaks sotsiaalseid norme ega tavasid
- ..... 3. Et olla täisväärtuslik, peab inimene olema iseseisev
- ..... 4. Inimene õpib paremini oma kogemustest ja tegudest kui teiste nõuandeid järgides
- ..... 5. Et asjad saaksid õigesti tehtud, tuleb need ise ära teha
- ..... 6. Inimene peab vältima sõltuvust teistest inimestest või asjadest - elu mõte ja keskpunkt peaksid paiknema inimeses endas
- ..... 7. Oma läbikukkumistes on vale süüdistada teisi
- ..... 8. Inimene peaks eelkõige oma sisemaailmale tähelepanu pöörama
- ..... 9. Otsuste tegemisel ei peaks end laskma mõjutada teiste arvamustest
- ..... 10. Tähtis on omada selget ning kindlat piiri iseenda ja teiste vahel
- ..... 11. Inimene peaks tegema asju omal viisil
- ..... 12. Elus saab edasi jõuda vaid iseendale toetudes
- ..... 13. Parim, mida inimene teha saab, on iseendasse süüvida
- ..... 14. Inimene peaks olema iseenda peremees ning puudma ise oma elukaiku suunata
- ..... 15. See, milline inimene on, tuleneb temast endast ja mitte tema kaaslastest
- ..... 16. Just iseseisvad ja sõltumatud inimesed viivad elu edasi
- ..... 17. Oma tegude tagajärgede eest vastutab iga inimene ise
- ..... 18. Inimene ei tohiks teiste arvamuste või tegudega mõtlematult kaasa minna
- ..... 19. Oma eelistuste väljendamisel peaks inimene olema avameelne ja siiras
- ..... 20. Vaid sõltumatuna saab inimene olla parim
- ..... 21. Inimese üle peaks otsustama tema enda omaduste ja mitte tema sõprade ja kaaslaste põhjal
- ..... 22. Oluline on mõelda ja tegutseda vabalt, ilma igasuguste sotsiaalsete piiranguteta
- ..... 23. Inimese tõelist olemust peegeldavad tema ideaalid, tunded ja unistused
- ..... 24. Igaüks peaks ise oma valikud tegema, ilma teiste abita
- ..... 25. Gruppi kuulumine hajutab vastutuse suurust
- ..... 26. Kõik siin ilmas sõltub inimese enda tahtest
- ..... 27. Inimene peaks seisma selle eest, mida ta õigeks peab, hoolimata sellest, mida teised arvavad
- ..... 28. Enesetäius peitub sõltumatuses
- ..... 29. Inimene peaks kohanema olukorra vajadustega ja tegema seda, mida temalt oodatakse
- ..... 30. Oma elutee kujundamine on iga inimese enda kätes
- ..... 31. Inimese tasuvaimaks uurimisobjektiks on tema enda siseelu
- ..... 32. Tänapäeval võib inimene loota ainult iseendale
- ..... 33. Inimese jaoks on peamine iseseisvus ning sõltumatus teistest

### 3-TIK

**A.** Alljärgnevalt on sõnastatud rida põhimõtteid ja väärtusi, millest inimesed oma elus juhinduvad. Esiteks palun hinnake seda, kuivõrd olulised on Teie jaoks alltoodud põhimõtted ja väärtused, kui suhtlete **oma lähedaste inimeste** või **perekonna liikmetega**. Vastamisel kasutage palun alljärgnevat 7-punktilist skaalat:

-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
on täiesti ebaoluline			on nii oluline kui ebaoluline/ ei oska öelda			on väga oluline

Valige vastus vahemikus -3 kuni +3 ning kirjutage see punktiirile, eeldusel et skaala ots- ja keskpunkti tähendused on määratletud järgmiselt:

- 3 kui antud põhimõte või väärtus on Teie jaoks täiesti ebaoluline
- 0 kui Te ei oska antud põhimõtte või väärtuse kohta oma hinnangut anda või kui see on Teie jaoks nii oluline kui ebaoluline
- +3 kui antud põhimõte või väärtus on Teie jaoks väga oluline

SUHETES LÄHEDASTE INIMESTE VÕI PEREKONNALIIKMETEGA,  
KUIVÕRD OLULINE ON TEIE JAOKS ...

- ..... 1. olla oma otsustes ja tegudes iseseisev
- ..... 2. teha asju omal viisil
- ..... 3. nendest mitte sõltuda
- ..... 4. seada esikohale oma isiklikud eesmärgid ja huvid
- ..... 5. sarnaneda neile / olla nende moodi
- ..... 6. nende seast silma paista või esile tõusta
- ..... 7. säilitada oma "mina"
- ..... 8. tunnetada oma rolli või ülesannet nende seas
- ..... 9. vastutada ise oma tegude eest
- ..... 10. suunata ise oma elukäiku
- ..... 11. tunnistada oma vigu
- ..... 12. mitte sekkuda nende ellu ega lasta neil sekkuda oma ellu
- ..... 13. samastada end nendega
- ..... 14. järgida nende poolt seatud norme
- ..... 15. hoolitseda nende eest, neid aidata
- ..... 16. olla neile lojaalne

**B.** Järgmiseks palun hinnake seda, kuivõrd olulised on Teie jaoks alltoodud põhimõtted ja väärtused, kui suhtlete **oma heade sõprade** või **kaaslastega**.

SUHETES HEADE SÕPRADE VÕI KAASLASTEGA,  
KUIVÕRD OLULINE ON TEIE JAOKS ...

- ..... 1. olla oma otsustes ja tegudes iseseisev
- ..... 2. teha asju omal viisil
- ..... 3. nendest mitte sõltuda
- ..... 4. seada esikohale oma isiklikud eesmärgid ja huvid
- ..... 5. sarnaneda neile / olla nende moodi
- ..... 6. nende seast silma paista või esile tõusta
- ..... 7. säilitada oma "mina"
- ..... 8. tunnetada oma rolli või ülesannet nende seas
- ..... 9. vastutada ise oma tegude eest
- ..... 10. suunata ise oma elukäiku
- ..... 11. tunnistada oma vigu
- ..... 12. mitte sekkuda nende ellu ega lasta neil sekkuda oma ellu
- ..... 13. samastada end nendega
- ..... 14. järgida nende poolt seatud norme
- ..... 15. hoolitseda nende eest, neid aidata
- ..... 16. olla neile lojaalne

**C.** Viimasena palun hinnake seda, kuivõrd olulised on Teie jaoks alltoodud põhimõtted ja väärtused suhetes **oma rahva ja riigiga**.

SUHETES OMA RAHVA VÕI RIIGIGA,  
KUIVÕRD OLULINE ON TEIE JAOKS ...

- ..... 1. olla oma otsustes ja tegudes iseseisev
- ..... 2. teha asju omal viisil
- ..... 3. nendest mitte sõltuda
- ..... 4. seada esikohale oma isiklikud eesmärgid ja huvid
- ..... 5. sarnaneda neile / olla nende moodi
- ..... 6. nende seast silma paista või esile tõusta
- ..... 7. säilitada oma "mina"
- ..... 8. tunnetada oma rolli või ülesannet nende seas
- ..... 9. vastutada ise oma tegude eest
- ..... 10. suunata ise oma elukäiku
- ..... 11. tunnistada oma vigu
- ..... 12. mitte sekkuda nende ellu ega lasta neil sekkuda oma ellu
- ..... 13. samastada end nendega
- ..... 14. järgida nende poolt seatud norme
- ..... 15. hoolitseda nende eest, neid aidata
- ..... 16. olla neile lojaalne